

CONFIDENTIAL  
Security Information

26 August 1952

MEMORANDUM FOR: Participants in the USSR and Southeast Asia Area Programs conducted by the Office of Training, summer 1952.

SUBJECT : Evaluation of Program.

The Office of Training wishes to prepare an evaluation of the two summer area programs held during July and August. This evaluation depends primarily on your assessments. It will be used for guidance in planning future related programs. Your contribution of comment and constructive suggestions will be much appreciated (It is emphasized that collection of only favorable, or uniformly favorable comments is not the object of this assessment. It is desired to assemble objective favorable and unfavorable comments as guidance for planning future related programs). It is suggested that your remarks include comment on the following points.

1. Do you feel that this type of area program can contribute to increasing analyst effectiveness? If so, why? If not, why not? What type of program would be more useful?

2. Do you feel that this particular program was useful to you? If so, how? If not, why not?

3. Please comment on the following:

a. Content and scope of subject matter (Particularly, did you feel that it was relevant or irrelevant to your normal work problems; that it was possibly relevant, but of a nature that it is assumed analysts in your component necessarily have before they can qualify for the work for which they were employed; that it was relevant, but too general or too specific.)

b. Number and method of presentation.

c. Time allotted for course (Was the number of weeks inadequate, adequate or excessive? Was the period of two hours for each session too short, satisfactory, or too long?)

d. Was the balance between lecture and discussion satisfactory, or do you feel that it would have been helpful to have more discussion or less discussion? Would you favor having certain periods devoted entirely to discussion of selected problems?

CONFIDENTIAL  
Security Information

CONFIDENTIAL  
Security Information

- 2 -

4. Do you approve of the policy that students not be required to do collateral reading or prepare papers, or do you think it would be both reasonable and useful if students expected to do limited reading and preparation of papers?

In addition to your remarks on the above points, any other comments or suggestions that you may wish to contribute for improvement of future related programs will be appreciated.

Please forward your written comments to [redacted] Room 1301, "I" Building as early as possible.

25X1

2 September 1952

1. I feel that this type of area program can contribute to increasing analyst effectiveness - if it is specific. As an analyst, I find myself with wide gaps in knowledge of specific aspects of Soviet government and economics. Lectures on such topics as the Orthodox Church in Russia, Soviet post-war foreign policy, the Soviet banking system, the Soviet educational system, Soviet industrial organization, etc., would be of far more benefit to me than a series, say, on Soviet history.

2. The program was of particular value as a "refresher course". Two years of reading the Soviet press, of seeing only the "trees" and not "the forest" tend to becloud the mind as to Soviet over-all policy.

3. I felt that the series of lectures on Soviet history presented by [redacted] was a complete waste of time both as to content and presentation. The time might have better been devoted to selected readings on the Soviet Union - from sources other than those chosen by [redacted].

The series presented by [redacted] was an inspiration, was excellent both as to the manner of presentation and the topic discussed. While [redacted] took a little time in getting down to specific problems of Soviet economics, his series of lectures were also excellent.

I felt that too much class time was devoted to the history series, too little to economics. Six consecutive weeks of lectures was a little too much; had they been scheduled with a week's intermission in between, I feel they would have been even more effective. The two-hour period is a good choice. Because of the wide disparity in the class's knowledge of Soviet history and institutions, I feel that discussion periods would be wasted for most students in discussing things already known to the majority of the class.

4. I, for one, do not think it unreasonable to expect limited collateral readings. A man of [redacted] excellence brings with him the inspiration to do such readings on the side.

I feel that the Office of Training deserves a vote of thanks for its selection of [redacted]

25X1  
25X1

CONFIDENTIAL  
Security Information